IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SHERRY DICK,

C.A. No.

Plaintiff,

v.

THE HARTFORD,

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Defendants.

Introduction

- 1. Sherry Dick ("Plaintiff") brings this action against The Hartford Insurance Company for violation of the Employment Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 1001 et. Seq. ("ERISA").
- 2. This complaint challenges the Defendant's unlawful denial of the Plaintiff's short term disability income benefits (STD) despite medical evidence demonstrating Plaintiff's qualifications for said benefits, and thereby depriving Plaintiff of the appropriate short term disability benefits due to her under the Plan.
- 3. Specifically, Plaintiff is filing this action to recover benefits due under a policy of insurance to enforce the present rights existing therein, to clarify her rights under the terms of the Plan, and to recover costs, and attorney fees as provided by ERISA.

Jurisdiction

4. This Court has personal and subject matter jurisdiction over this case under 29 U.S.C. §1132(e) and (f), because the defendant's breach of its ERISA obligations took place in this district.

Case 1:08-cv-00470-SD

FACTS

- 5. The Plaintiff is a resident of the State of Delaware residing in Milford, Delaware.
- 6. The Plaintiff is a participant in the Plan, an ERISA welfare benefit plan that is administered by The Hartford Insurance Company.
- 7. The Plaintiff has standing to bring this action under ERISA, 29 U.S.C. §1132 (a).
- 8. Defendant, the Hartford has its corporate headquarters located at Hartford, Connecticut.
- 9. Defendant is a for-profit corporation and does business in the State of Delaware deriving revenue from the business it conducts in the State.
- 10. At all times pertinent, the Plaintiff was working full time at ILC Industries, Inc. where she was covered under the Plan.
- Plaintiff was employed at ILC Industries, Inc. for 2 1/2 years as Team Assembler. 11.
- 12. Plaintiff was entitled to short term disability benefits under the Plan.
- 13. To meet the definition of Total Disability under the Plan, the Plaintiff must not have been able to perform the essential duties of her occupation including assembling and packing hoods and the physical demands associated with these duties including a continuing amount of standing.
- The Plaintiff's doctor stated that the Plaintiff was restricted from standing as of 14. August 21, 2007, her first day out of work.
- 15. On August 20, 2007, the Plaintiff was directed by her Doctor stop working due to her being 20 weeks pregnant.
- 16. On August 21, 2007, Plaintiff's medical provider certified that the Plaintiff had a serious medical condition and that medical leave was necessary from work.

- 17. The Plaintiff presented a timely claim for STD to the Defendant based on complications related to her pregnancy.
- 18. The Plaintiff was totally disabled as defined under the Plan.
- 19. The Plaintiff is entitled to benefits from August 20, 2007 until her postpartum.
- 20. The Defendant rationalized their denial of benefits stating that there was no evidence of any medical complications or restrictions that would cause the Plaintiff her to be unable to perform the essential duties of her occupation more than two weeks prior to her estimated delivery date.
- 21. On September 26, 2007, the Plaintiff filed an appeal concerning Defendant's denial of benefits.
- 22. On October 3, 2007, the Defendant denied Plaintiff's appeal of their decision denying her short-term disability benefits.
- 23. The Plaintiff demonstrated through medical evidence that she is was totally disabled as defined under the Plan.
- 24. The Defendant was both the claims administrator and the payor of the benefits, when it denied Plaintiff's STD benefits, obviously a conflict of interest.
- 25. The Hartford funds the plan, which it administers.
- 26. The administrator used a self-serving approach by rejecting the overwhelming evidence that supported Plaintiff's claim for benefits.
- 27. Due to the unlawful actions of the Defendant under ERISA, the Plaintiff was denied STD benefits, which were rightfully hers.

Case 1:08-cv-00470-SD

- 28. The Plaintiff has exhausted all administrative procedures provided by the Defendant.
- 29. The Defendant breached its fiduciary duty in violation of 29 U.S.C. §1132 in the following ways:
- 1) Its consideration of the evidence was self-serving. The Defendant rejected evidence of the Plaintiff's physician and gave more weight to evidence that would favor a refusal of benefits.
- 2) The Defendant ignored the Attending Physician's Statement diagnosis of pregnancy, insulin dependent diabetes, and that the Plaintiff cannot stand all day at work and tired easily.
- 3) The Defendant ignored that fact that her Physician directed her not to work until post-partum.
- 30. The Defendant's denial of STD benefits is unlawful under ERISA, under 29 U.S.C. §1132(a)(1).

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that this Honorable Court grant her the following relief:

- Declaratory relief that she is entitled to disability benefits in the past with interest; a.
- Ъ. Reasonable attorney fees and costs pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §1132(g);
- Alternatively, a remand that Defendant consider all of the evidence and how it c. impacted Plaintiff's ability to work.
- d. Such other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

YOUNG, MALMBERG & HOWARD, P.A.

Ronald G. Poliquin, Esquire I.D. No. 4447 30 The Green Dover, DE 19901

(302) 672-5600

Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: July 28, 2008

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SHERRY DICK,

:

Plaintiff,

•

v.

C.A. No.

THE HARTFORD

COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Defendants.

AFFIDAVIT OF VERIFICATION

STATE OF DELAWARE

: SS

COUNTY OF KENT

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on this 22 day of May 2008, personally came before me, the Subscriber, a Notary Public for the State and County aforesaid, SHERRY DICK known to me personally to be such, who being duly sworn according to law, did depose and say that the foregoing Complaint is true and correct to the best of her knowledge and belief.

SHERRYDICK

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED before me the day and year first above-written.

Notary Public

RONALD G POLIQUIN ATTORNEY AT LAW MEMBER OF THE DELAWARE BAR **S**JS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS						
Sherry	Dick			The		tfo	rd			
•	of First Listed Plaintiff	Kent		County of Residen			d Defendant	New	Castl	و
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.						
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name	e, Address, and Telephone Numb	er)Ronald G. P	bliquin	Attorneys (If Know	wn)					
Dover, DE	- 19901 302-	672-5600								
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP O		NCIPA	L PARTIES			
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)									ant) DEF 4	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) 		Citize	n of Another State	5 2	□ 2	Incorporated and I of Business In A			□ 5
				Citizen or Subject of a C Foreign Country			Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI			e le ro	n percenta e de la lace	rvześolika	adole Trus	KRUPTCY	les orn	nero Segnya gertag	me.
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	PERSONAL INJUR Beginson of the product Liability of the product Liabil	Y 616 625 625 625 635 635 636 63	O Agriculture O Other Food & Drug 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 86 O Liquor Laws O Arline Regs. O Cocupational Safety/Health O Other LABOR O Labor/Mgmt. Relation O Labor/Mgmt. Relation O Labor/Mgmt. Relation Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act I MMIGRATION O National Security Act O Labor Labor Standards Act O Labor Latingation O Labor Labor Standards O Labor/Mgmt. Reporting O Labor/Mgmt. Relation O Labor/Mgmt. Relation O Labor/Mgmt. Relation O Labor/Mgmt. Relation O Labor/Mgmt. Reporting O Labor/Mgmt. Relation O Labor/Mgmt.	81 Solution (1) So	422 Appe 423 With 28 U. *PROPE 820 Copy 830 Pater 840 Trad *** **SOCIAL 861 HIA 862 Black 863 DIW 864 SSID 865 RSI (*** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *	cal 28 USC 158 drawal SC 157 RTY-RIGHTS rrights at emark SECURITY (1395ff) c Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g))	400 Stat 410 Ant 430 Ban 450 Con 460 Dep 470 Rac 200 Ago 310 Sele 810 Sele 875 Cus 875 Cus 890 Oth 891 Agr 892 Eco 893 Env 894 Ene 895 Free Act 900App	ks and Bankir nmerce	ced and tions odities/ age ctions ration Act latters a Act mation ermination ermination
Y. ORIGIN Continue Continue										
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	tute under which you a	re filing (I	Do not cite jurisdict	tional st	atutes u	nless diversity):	26 U.S	4 .	001
VI. CAUSE OF ACI	Brief description of ca	use: Erisa Cl	aim							
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F,R.C.P. 23				EMAND \$		CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Ö Yes No				
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE				DOCKE	T NUMBER			
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD										
7-18-03 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY										
RECEIPT# A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGI	E		MAG. JUI	OGE		